



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/401,383	09/22/1999	PEIYA LIU	99P7817US	4597

7590 06/07/2004

SIEMENS CORPORATION
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT
186 WOOD AVENUE SOUTH
ISELIN, NJ 08830

EXAMINER

YUAN, ALMARI ROMERO

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

DATE MAILED: 06/07/2004

13

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/401,383

Applicant(s)

LIU ET AL.

Examiner

Almari Yuan

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 March 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-12,14 and 16-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,5-6,10-12,14 and 16-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 3,4 and 7-9 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment filed on 3/03/04.
2. The rejection of claims 1 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sundaresan , Stechmann, and Ross has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment.
3. The rejection of claims 4-5 and 8-11 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sundaresan , Stechmann, Ross, and Ferrel has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment.
4. Claims 17-20 are newly added claims. Claims 1, 3-12, 14 and 16-20 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 6, and 12 are independent claims.

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 3-4 and 7-9 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2176

7. **Claims 1, 6, 11, 17-18, and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferrel et al. (USPN 5,860,073 – filed 07/1995) in view of Boag et al. (USPN 6,589,291 B1 – filed 04/1999).**

Regarding independent claims 1 and 6, Ferrel discloses:

A system and method for automatic generation of card-based formatting object description comprising:

a presentation style transformer for receiving a card display schema and a card layout style specification and for generating a card-based presentation (Ferrel on col. 6, lines 25-36 teaches design (presentation) is the layout (schema) and style of the data; the design is how information gets displayed to the user); and

a card-based presentation generator connected to said presentation style transformer for receiving said card-based presentation specification and markup language document content (Ferrel on col. 6, lines 37-46 teaches content (text and graphics) and the design (presentation) are stored as separate objects)

and for providing an abstract description of formatting directives of a presentation document (Ferrel on col. 19, lines 8-11 and 36-51 teaches the style sheet provides description of formatting tags or provides formatting instructions of how the content is to be displayed).

However, Ferrel does not explicitly disclose “card layout style specification”.

Boag on col. 1, lines 24-44 teaches a “style sheet” is a specification of a style that is to be used when presenting a document.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Boag into Ferrel to provide a specification of a style such a

style sheet, as taught by Boag, incorporated into the style sheets of Ferrel, in order to indicate how the presented document should appear.

Regarding dependent claims 11, 18, and 20, Ferrel discloses:

a specification of a sequence of FOD flow objects (Ferrel on col. 29, lines 39-44 teaches each node within the parsed tree may contain embedded objects).

Regarding dependent claims 17 and 19, Ferrel discloses:

non-textual content (Ferrel on col. 6, lines 37-46 teaches content can be graphics).

8. **Claims 5 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferrel and Boag, as applied to claims 1 and 6 above, and further in view of Ferrel et al. (USPN 5,907,837 – filed 11/1995 herein after “Ferrel ‘837”).**

Regarding dependent claims 5 and 10, Ferrel and Boag disclose the invention substantially as claimed as described supra.

Ferrel discloses “mapper” on col. 31, lines 59-62 teaches mapping tags to styles and applying styles to text.

However, do not explicitly disclose “ FOD converter”.

Ferrel ‘837 on col. 19, line 45 – col. 20, line 23: teaches object converter.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Ferrel ‘837 into Ferrel and Boag to provide a way to convert objects, as taught by Ferrel ‘837, incorporated into the systems of Ferrel and Boag, to enhance the display of a document based on template.

Art Unit: 2176

9. **Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sundaresan (USPN 6,487,566 B1 – filing date: 10/1998) in view of Stechmann et al. (USPN 5,617,528 – issue date: 4/1997).**

Regarding independent claim 12, Sundaresan discloses:

A method for automatic generation of card-based presentation documents from multimedia data comprising the steps of:

resource description (Sundaresan on col. 1, lines 44-50: teaches markup encodes a description of a documents layout and logical structure);

translating declarative card layout style specifications into procedural card-based presentation specifications (Sundaresan on col. 12, lines 35-54: teaches transformation of specifications).

However, Sundaresan does not explicitly disclose “generating a card based presentation”.

Stechmann on col. 8, lines 54-65: teaches generate card designs or layouts.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Stechmann into Sundaresan to provide a way to generate card designs as a template for the transformation into language specification in order to increase the flexibility in the layout of card designs.

10. **Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sundaresan and Stechmann as applied to claim 12 above, and further in view of Shimizu et al. (USPN 6,374,271 B1 – filing date: 9/1997).**

Art Unit: 2176

Regarding dependent claim 14, Sundaresan and Stechmann disclose the invention substantially as claimed as described *supra*. Sundaresan discloses:

wherein translating declarative card layout style specifications comprises the steps of: building a card-based context tree (Sundaresan on col. 11, lines 34-62: teaches building a tree); and generating a content mapping rule (Sundaresan on col. 6, line 65 – col. 7, line 3: teaches matching for rule specifications).

However, Sundaresan and Stechmann do not explicitly disclose “building context paths”.

Shimizu on col. 4, lines 2-19 and col. 8, lines 17-19: teaches hypertext linking as paths.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Shimizu into Sundaresan and Stechmann to provide a path to walk (linking) between nodes into the building and matching (mapping) of a tree structure to provide sufficient support for navigating and organizing information content of a document structure.

11. **Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sundaresan and Stechmann as applied to claim 12 above, and further in view of Ross et al. (USPN 6,026,417 – filed 05/1997).**

Regarding dependent claim 16, Sundaresan and Stechmann disclose the invention substantially as claimed as described *supra*. Sundaresan discloses:

mapping CPS constructs into card-based DSSSL style constructs (Sundaresan on col. 6, line 65 – col. 7, line 3: teaches matching for built tree of a specification).

However, Sundaresan and Stechmann do not explicitly disclose “creating card-based document flow object tree and converting card-based document flow object tree into formatting object descriptions”

Ross on col. 7, line 55 – col. 8, line 15: teaches flow of objects in a tree and formatting objects with descriptions.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Ross into Sundaresan and Stechmann to provide a way to format objects with descriptions of a transformed template or design which will decrease the time consuming and tedious process of creating a layout of a document.

Response to Arguments

12. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3-11, 17-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Regarding Applicant's remarks on page 16:

Referring to independent claim 12, Sundaresan does disclose “translating specifications” on col. 12, lines 35-54: teaches transformation of specifications.

Applicant argues that the card template is being translated, however, the Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant. The claim language of claim 12 is interpreted as a translation being performed from one specification into another specification as taught by Sundaresan.

Therefore, the rejection of all claims is maintained.

Art Unit: 2176

Conclusion

13. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.


Art Unit: 2176

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Almari Yuan whose telephone number is 703-305-5945. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays - Fridays (8:30am - 5:00pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Feild, can be reached on 703-305-9792. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AY
June 1, 2004


JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER